DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 112 HE 008 593

AUTHOR Weislogel, Louis F.
TITLE Campus Police. A Study of Existing Policies and Procedures Among the Pennsylvania State Colleges and University and Resultant Implications for Policy Development at West Chester State College. Educational Policies.
PUB DATE 23 Nov 76
NOTE 61p.; Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Employment Practices; *Higher Education; Investigations; Job Training; *Law Enforcement; *Police School Relationship; Policy; *Policy Formation; School Administration; *School Safety; State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Campus Security

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to make recommendations for the development of policy concerning law enforcement at West Chester State College. A survey was conducted of existing law enforcement policies and procedures within the Pennsylvania State colleges. The investigation focused on mission, staffing, training, equipping, and organization. Questionnaires and interviews were used to obtain data. Missions assigned campus police varied. Most schools preferred the "security-safety" function. Eight-five percent of the departments were located in the administrative affairs division of the institution. The institution's complements were similar despite differing enrollment and geographical locations. There was consensus for requiring the associate degree for employment. In order to improve training, results indicated a need for better articulation between the institutions and the Law Enforcement Academy. Issues affecting policy development were the use of "rent-a-cops," the small number of blacks and women employed, and the use of student security. Results of the study led to a recommendation that the police department be titled Department of Law Enforcement and Safety and its members be called Peace Officers. Trained officers should be permitted to carry firearms. The formation of an all-college committee to formulate operating policy procedures was suggested. Attention should be given to affirmative action guidelines in developing employment policies. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134112

CAMPUS POLICE

A STUDY OF EXISTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AMONG THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY AND RESULTANT IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

by

Louis F. Weislogel

West Chester State College

DR. KENNETH MILLER
CLUSTER COORDINATOR

EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

November 23, 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008593

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF EXISTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AMONG THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY AND RESULTANT IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE

BY

Louis F. Weislogel

Educational Policies Eastern Pennsylvania Cluster

With the increase of crime on campus the role of security has changed, and need exists for professionally trained police. A problem arises on how to strike a balance between the need to provide a peace-keeping force with the means necessary to enforce the law and the need to maintain safeguards for individual liberties. Policies that stress the special nature of the academic setting are needed.

The purpose of the study was to make recommendations for the development of policy concerning law enforcement at West Chester State College. A survey was conducted of existing law enforcement policies and procedures within the Pennsylvania state colleges. The investigation focused on the mission, staffing, training, equipping and organization. Questionnaires and interviews were used to obtain data.

Missions assigned campus police varied. Most schools preferred the "security-safety" function. Eighty-five percent of the departments were located in the administrative affairs division of the institution. The institutions' complements were similar despite differing enrollment and geographical

locations. There was consensus for requiring the associate degree for employment. In order to improve training, results indicated a need for better articulation between the institutions and the Law Enforcement Academy. Issues affecting policy development were the use of "rent-a-cops," the small number of blacks and women employed, and the use of student security.

Results of the study led to a recommendation that the police department be titled Department of Law Enforcement and Safety and its members be called Peace Officers. Trained officers should be permitted to carry firearms. The formation of an all college committee to formulate operating policy procedures was suggested. Attention should be given to affirmative action guidelines in developing employment policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
PROCEDURES	24
RESULTS	29
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
REFERENCES	47
APPENDIX	
A. SURVEY ON CAMPUS POLICE	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Campus Police West Chester State College Actual Criminal Offenses Known	10
2.	Pennsylvania State Colleges & University Official Titles of Campus Law Enforcement Agency and Administrative Officer to Whom Agency Reports	30
3.	Pennsylvania State Colleges and University Complement of Law Enforcement Agencies Broken Down by Civil Service Classification	33
4.	Pennsylvania State Colleges and University Complement of Law Enforcement Agencies Broken Down by Sex and Race.	34
5.	Pennsylvania State Colleges and University Law Enforcement Agencies' Availability of Equipment.	36

INTRODUCTION

West Chester State College, like all academic institutions, recognizes its obligation to provide its students, faculty, and administrators with an atmosphere where the search for truth can flourish free from any suggestion of repression. At the same time, the College is cognizant of the fact that it functions in an increasingly metropolitan area, with all the problems of protection of life and property that are a consequence of that environment.

A number of changes have taken place in campus law enforcement in the last ten years. No longer do campus security programs have to be geared to cope with student dissent and activism. During the last decade serious crime waves have emerged for the first time on college campuses. Students are calling for more police protection. Campus law enforcement is concentrating on the prevention of crime and public safety programs.

The problem of crime has resulted in a rather rapid change in the direction and concept of campus security. The overriding change is that to successfully combat crime on campus and to provide efficient protection and response, a campus department must take on the role of a progressive, well trained, knowledgeable law enforcement agency.

West Chester State College is located in a community in close proximity to a major urban area. The campus law enforcement department is compelled to deal with a variety of

crimes, including rape, robbery, mugging, and vandalism, in addition to petty thefts and parking violations. The majority of the criminal acts that the campus police deal with involve non-students, juvenile and adult, who have come to the campus for obviously nonacademic purposes. Therefore, there is a need for a professionally trained and well-equipped police force on the campus.

A police force operating in such a milieu requires precise written policies, developed with input from all the constituencies of the campus, that stress the special nature of the academic setting. Unfortunately, West Chester is lacking such policies. Sims (1971, p. 66), writing about campus law enforcement departments, states, "There is a need for written policy with precise and lucid objectives for the departments. This sounds elementary and is, but few have such a document." In addition there have been no uniform guidelines developed within the system of the fourteen state owned colleges and university with regard to the appropriate responsibilities to be exercised by the campus police.

The purpose of this study was to examine the various policies developed and procedures utilized with respect to law enforcement by the fourteen state owned institutions. A survey, using a questionnaire, was conducted to determine the nature and extent of the law enforcement operations at each of the fourteen schools. Opinions concerning function and policy of campus police were obtained through personal interviews of administrators responsible for law enforcement, faculty members of criminal justice departments and the Department of Education Law Enforcement Academy, and

chiefs or directors of campus law enforcement departments within the state system. The results were used to recommend, to the campus governance structure, policy for the operation of the West Chester State College law enforcement department. Furthermore, the results of this study will serve as the data base for a task force investigating the ramifications of establishing state wide policies to assist campus police in doing a professional job while protecting the rights and freedoms of members of the academic community.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The development of policy is difficult because the campus setting is unique as far as law enforcement is concerned (Evangelides and Browner 1976). The major difficulty is how to deal with both the growing incidence of serious crime on campus and with the objections to police presence which inevitably arise from the campus community.

In a free society the question of striking a balance between the need to provide peace-keeping forces with the means necessary to enforce the law and the need to maintain safeguards for individual liberties requires tact and discretion. In a college community the problem is complicated by the need to provide an open atmosphere conducive to the academic enterprise.

No longer do campus security programs have to be geared to cope with student dissent and activism. The days of mass confrontations, sit-ins, and similar problems do not exist. The adversarial relationship between law enforcement and the campus community which accompanied this period of unrest is declining. There is, however, serious need for a continuing examination of policy to meet the demands of a post-riot generation of students.

The mistrust of some portions of the academic community toward law enforcement officials is an unfortunate fact. In order for campus police to do a professional job while protecting the rights of members of the academic

community, there is a need for formalized policy. Written policy is necessary to aid campus police officers in doing their job, in light of the fact that they operate in an academic community not just a municipality.

There is no lack of written material dealing with policy for municipal police administration and the technical aspects of crime fighting. Most concepts are applicable to the campus police function. The adaptation can best be made, however, with certain modifications. Such changes become desirable because of the unique atmosphere of the college campus. Municipalities vary from campuses politically, administratively, ecologically and psychologically. Therefore, it becomes difficult to organize a police department at an institution of higher learning using municipal criteria without converting certain concepts to the academic community (Nielson 1971).

Campus law enforcement is charged with the enforcement of federal, state, and municipal laws and ordinances as well as institutional rules and regulations. The latter responsibility is the factor that makes a campus police department unique. It in effect requires the members of the department to be members of the academic community.

It is the responsibility of the entire academic community for the development of a professional law enforcement department. Law enforcement on the college campus must be viewed as part of the total educational experience. Powell (1974) writes that an effective campus security program or law enforcement operation must be part of the educational process and cannot hope to be successful unless it gains the

respect and confidence of the community. Campus law enforcement must be compatible with the major role of the institution, providing a learning community atmosphere. Emphasis must be placed on educating and assisting students, and on spanning the communication gap to gain their cooperation (American School and University 1974).

The development of policy requires recognizing the unique posture of institutions of higher education as separate communities, functioning within the laws of the larger community. For example, campus police operate on a campus that has its own internal disciplinary system which is a carry over of the days of _in loco parentis_. Traditionally colleges have reserved the right to discipline students and personnel for minor infractions of regulations (LeMay 1968). Campus police need specific policy on how to deal with incidents involving students. Another vital but sensitive issue, requiring a clearly defined policy, is the handling of demonstrations and student disruptions (Carnegie Commission 1971). The fact that the academic community maintains serious reservations concerning the use of force on campus, especially guns, complicates the work of campus police. At the same time that the campus police are obliged to operate within the framework of a scholarly community, they must be able to meet the challenge of increased crime on the campus from various other elements of society.

The predominant problem faced by all campus security forces today is crime. The crime rate has been rising at colleges and universities for several years. Authorities say it is a reflection of growing lawlessness in the com-

munity at large (Burns Security Institute 1976). There is a growing need for a well trained campus police force on many campuses. The need is particularly acute on campuses where the kinds of crimes that must be dealt with include rape, robbery, assault, and burglary, in addition to petty theft, vandalism and parking and traffic violations. The campus law enforcement department must be able to meet this challenge of increasing crime on campus in order to effectively service the campus community.

During the last decade there has been an increase in serious crime on college campuses (Time 1973). Campus police are concerned about the growing number of crimes against people and property that are occurring within their jurisdiction (Watkins 1975). According to Hood & Hodges (1974), factors such as increasing crime rates in society at large, drug use on the campus, student possession of stereos, tape decks, cameras, calculators and other items that can be sold easily in the streets, and the open accessibility of the campus have resulted in an increased variety of frequency of campus crime.

A recent survey indicates most of the crimes on campuses are committed by nonstudents from surrounding areas (U. S. News & World Report 1971). They are drawn to the campus by the open nature of life there. Powell (1972, p. 18) writes, "Open campus concepts today result in a close intermingling of the outside community and campus. This trend was long overdue, but the outside community brings along its undesirables and its crime problems."

Problems with security in campus residence halls

have become especially important. College students are demanding increasingly more independence and freedom from traditional residence hall regulations, resulting in such changes as the elimination of hours for women and the inception of 24-hour visitation. The pressure for increased campus security is occurring at the same time students have been asking for relaxation of controls and living styles that tend to diminish security (Hood and Hodges 1974).

As a result of this increase of serious crime on campus, students and others in the campus community are calling for a higher level of protection and service. The courts are supporting this opinion. The extent to which a college or university may be legally responsible for providing security for its students, particularly those residing in its dormitories, is currently in the federal courts. An appeal now pending in U. S. District Court may establish new responsibilities on colleges and universities for the protection of their students and employees against violent crime (Magarrell 1976). This decision will certainly have impact on the policies and procedures of campus law enforcement departments.

The increase in crime on college and university campuses nationally is reflected locally by crime statistics. Federal and state crime statistics, compiled from the records of local police departments, show that the borough in which West Chester State College is located had the highest number of serious crimes reported in 1975 in Chester County. The college campus ranked seventh out of twenty-nine police departments in the county in reported serious crime offenses

(Pennsylvania State Police 1975).

Table I shows the results of a study conducted by this author to determine the extent of crime on the West Chester State College campus. The results indicate a gradual increase in serious crime at the college over a five year period. The "serious" offenses compiled are called Part One crimes and are defined in the Pennsylvania Uniform Statistics Act of 1970. They include homicide, forcible rape, robbery, serious assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft. Less serious offenses, called Part Two crimes, are also reported. Some examples are minor assaults, drunkenness, vandalism, disorderly conduct, and narcotic law violations. The table also indicates the total number of complaints and incidents investigated by the campus police.

While this study was being conducted a student was shot and wounded and two other students escaped injury during a shooting incident on campus (Quad 1976). Another major incident involved the assault and attempted rape of a female resident student returning to her dormitory during the evening hours. The college newspaper in an editorial stated, "It is a sad day when one has to walk around campus with the fear of being shot or attacked" (Quad, p. 4). The editorial went on to ask the administration to pay attention to the threatening situation that exists on campus and to take immediate action to remedy the situation.

Campus police departments must direct their efforts at providing a high level of alert and knowledgeable protection, response and service to combat this rising crime on campus. Students in the 1970s have a growing need for the

Table 1

CAMPUS POLICE
WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE

ACTUAL CRIMINAL OFFENSES KNOWN

Part I Crimes	1972	1973	1974	1975	Oct., 1976
RAPE	1	2	0	0	0
ROBBERY	2	1	0	1	3
ASSAULT	12	6	12	13	5
BURGLARY	49	42	56	102	71
LARCENY-THEFT	130	141	214	249	209
AUTO THEFT	6	8	7	8	5
TOTAL	200	200	289	373	293

Part II Crimes	1972	1973	1974	1975	Oct., 1976
ARSON	0	0	1	2	1
FORGERY COUNTERFEITING	0	0	0	2	1
STOLEN PROPERTY	0	0	0	0	1
VANDALISM	32	20	118	57	49
WEAPONS OFFENSE	1	1	0	1	0
SEX OFFENSE	3	1	6	11	3
NARCOTICS	6	7	2	6	1
DRIVING UNDER INFLUENCE	1	0	0	0	0
LIQUOR LAWS	0	2	9	3	10
DRUNKENNESS	0	0	1	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	1	26	5	12	6
ALL OTHERS	117	62	42	58	60
TOTAL	161	119	184	152	133

TOTALS	1972	1973	1974	1975	Oct., 1976
PART I CRIMES	200	200	289	373	293
PART II CRIMES	161	119	184	152	133
GRAND TOTALS	361	319	473	525	426

COMPLAINTS/INCIDENTS BY YEAR

1972	-	950
1973	-	1102
1974	-	1582
1975	-	2153
Oct., 1976	-	1943

police they shunned in the 1960s.

The purpose of this study was to define the function of the campus law enforcement department and to make constructive recommendations for developing policy to carry out that function. The study was conducted as part of a module of study on Educational Policy Systems in Higher Education for Nova University. One of the goals of the policy module is to examine the role of various influence groups affecting policy determination in institutions of higher education. Policy decisions are made within the framework of certain external constraints and in a political context involving individual and group interests, attitudes, and influence of the constituents (McCabe 1973).

One issue of major significance in higher education during the last two decades has been the role of police on the college campus. No issue better demonstrates the impact of various external and internal political forces than the changing role of campus law enforcement. In the development of any institutional policy concerning campus police, one must consider the actions of such outside groups as the state legislature, the courts, the state Department of Education, and the Board of State College and University Directors and the local board of trustees. In addition, the internal pressures brought to bear by the various constituencies of the college community must be understood.

The interest of government in higher education policy has increased substantially over the last two decades. In studying the literature related to this module, it was evident that state legislatures have taken a greater interest in

the establishment of policy, based on the assumption that they are the representatives of society and the colleges were developed to serve society (McCabe 1973). One of the reasons for increased government intervention into higher education according to Blocker, Bender and Marturana (1975) has been the "politicization of higher education." The American public has traditionally insisted upon a separation of higher education, both public and private, from the political system. According to these writers the political penetration of higher education began following World War II and reached its major era during the student and faculty activism of the 1960s. The campus events of the late 1960s made apparent the need for a professionally trained, sensitized campus police force (Levi 1969; Linowitz 1970).

A number of states have enacted legislation to give police authority to campus officers. Although legislation varies from state to state, the main thrust is to provide campus officers with police powers (powers of arrest, etc.) on college or university premises and contiguous areas. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entered the picture by passing legislation in 1968 which made it possible for the state owned and state aided or related colleges and universities to maintain a police force (Act 149). The whole purpose of Act 149 was to provide institutions of higher education with a vehicle to develop a police department that could meet the unique needs and demands of the academic community.

Since the passage of Act 149 in 1968, creating campus police, most of the fourteen state owned colleges and university have worked to create professional, well trained law

enforcement agencies on each campus. Much progress has been made to create organizations to handle the unique problems of law enforcement on the college campus. However, little has been accomplished in the formulation of policy concerning the operation of these agencies.

The passage of Act 75 in 1975 by the state legislature also has impact on the development of campus police policy. Act 75 permits campus police officers to assist municipal police in emergency situations (Act 75). Concern over the lack of college policy in this area was registered by the Chester County District Attorney's office (Abell 1976). It is important that formalized policy be established in this area since the campus is located in part in three different townships and a borough, each with its own police force.

Recognition of the need for the formulization of policy regarding campus law enforcement has come from various outside groups and from within the department of law enforcement. The impetus for this study came from several directions. Early in April, 1976 the Board of Presidents[1] established a task force to review the law enforcement policies of the fourteen state owned colleges and university for the purpose of establishing some commonality on policy and procedures. It was interesting to note the minutes reflect the

---

[1]The Board of Presidents, constituted under Pennsylvania, PL 13, Sec. 204, February 17, 1970, consists of the presidents of the fourteen state owned colleges and university and the Secretary of Education. The purpose of the board is to formulate and recommend educational policies for the state colleges and university and act in an advicory capacity to the Board of State College and University Directors.

concern of the presidents about the involvement of external bodies imposing policy, when it was stated, "There is a need to address certain state wide issues before external agencies step in to deal with them" (Minutes, Board of Presidents 1976).

The concern at the state level for clarification and unification of policy was reflected in correspondence by the Regional Legal Counsel of the Department of Education to the chairman of the Board of Presidents Task Force. Counsel reported on a number of questions that had been raised by the department and other state agencies concerning campus police and security (Kauffman correspondence 1976).

At the July 15, 1976 meeting, the Board of State College and University Directors (SCUD Board)[2] indicated concern over the lack of uniform police policy and requested that all the institutions provide the board with information concerning law enforcement policies on each campus (Minutes, Board of State College and University Directors 1976). The office of the Executive Secretary of the SCUD Board was charged with requesting the information and collating the material for the board. The secretary, in turn, requested the task force of the Board of Presidents to forward their report to him for transmission to the state directors. The President of West Chester, who is chairman of the task force,

---

[2]The Board of State College and University Directors, constituted under Pennsylvania, PL 13, Sec. 2004, February 17, 1970, consists of fifteen directors appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The purpose of the board is to plan for and coordinate the development of the system of state colleges in Pennsylvania.

discussed his committee's assignment with this author, and it was agreed that the results of this practicum would serve as a working paper for the task force.

In March, 1975 the local Board of Trustees of West Chester State College expressed interest in law enforcement policies and procedures. The trustees formed a three member committee to look into the justification of weapons being carried by the campus force (Minutes, Board of Trustees West Chester State College 1975).

The West Chester State College Faculty Senate has maintained over the years continuing interest in the campus police department. In July, 1976 the Senate passed a resolution requesting the President to establish a committee involving all segments of the campus to submit a proposed comprehensive policy regarding the functions of the campus police department to the rest of the academic community (Minutes, Faculty Senate 1976).

In addition to the interest of state and local groups there is a need for policy definition and codification from within the department. In October, 1975 the college underwent an administrative reorganization in which the law enforcement department was placed administratively under the Vice President for Student Affairs. The author, having had a year to observe the organization and operation of the department, feels there is a definite need to have a policy and procedures manual for the campus police that would stress the special nature of the academic setting as it affects the campus law enforcement department's protective role.

Before consideration can be given to the formulation

of operating policy for the West Chester State College law enforcement department, a number of issues must be examined. First, the mission of the campus police must be determined since all other policy decisions must be made in light of that mission. The position of the law enforcement department in the institution's administrative structure must be decided. Consideration must be given to the problems of personnel selection and training. Attention should be focused on the internal organization of the department. Equipment needs in areas such as communications, weapons, and automobiles should be reviewed. The campus department must be staffed, trained, organized and equipped so that it can adequately perform all police services required by the campus community. Answers to all of these critical issues must be determined in order to constructively propose policy for the operation of the West Chester State College campus law enforcement department.

Before consideration can be given to policy determination, the mission of the campus law department must be identified. Traditionally the early function of campus police was limited to plant protection. Over the years, however, it has developed into a pseudo-police function. It has often been a part of the in loco parentis function with a mixture of police function and student discipline concerns.

The events of the 1960s changed that function. Today the increase of crime is affecting that mission. There have been many improvements in the function in the last ten years on the part of colleges and universities through attempts to achieve greater professionalism of the people assigned to law enforcement (Powell 1970).

As the shift of emphasis from security to police takes place, campus law enforcement forces have been in the process of developing and upgrading their function to a more professional level (Dukiet 1973). Campus security will become more and more self sufficient and more and more patterned after progressive law enforcement, while still remaining sensitive to the needs and climate of the academic community. The primary mission of campus law enforcement today is the protection of life and property, and the prevention and detection of crime. All officers are on duty to provide protection and to prevent and deter crime and to offer maximum service possible. Campus security will continue to stress service to people and human relations, cultivating the capability to cope with the "people problems" that plague campuses today rather than acting solely as protectors of campus property (Powell 1972).

A determination must be made relative to placing the campus police within the administrative structure of the college or university. The literature on this subject is fairly definite. For the most effective administration of campus police, the chief must be placed in a position where he answers directly to a general officer of the institution.

Traditionally, campus security was part of the physical plant department. This was because the early function of campus police was limited to plant protection. A survey conducted in 1968 of 185 institutions showed 41 percent of the campus police departments were under the administration of the physical plant department or business manager (Whitehead and Van Meter 1968).

The same study showed that in ten percent of the institutions responding, the campus police reported to the Dean of Students. The supporting principle of having the police department as part of the Dean of Students' office is the department's involvement with student discipline. Sims (1971, p. 66) writes, "Historically, it is impossible to discuss the role and function of campus law enforcement without viewing also the role and function of the office of the Dean of Student Affairs." Practically speaking, the two were synonymous for many years. Prior to the 1960s student affairs was, in the minds of many, campus law enforcement, and campus law enforcement was involved only with parking problems and building security. The events of the 1960s changed that concept.

The trend today is to divorce campus security from plant operations and have the head of security answer to a vice president for administration or some similar position with broad responsibilities, as opposed to the relatively narrow responsibilities of the physical plant director, business manager, or personnel dean. Dukiet (1973) writes that campus security should be a separate department reporting to a vice president of administration or planning. This enables the director or chief to answer high in the administration and be involved in planning and decision making.

Bernitt (1971) recommends that the law enforcement operation function either in the office of the president or an executive vice president. Both of these administrative positions have campus-wide responsibility that is concerned with all people that make up the community. All the other

officers of an institution are concerned with a specific segment of the total population. Nielsen (1971, p. 11) states, "An effort should be made to establish the campus police as an island with an administrative bridge to a general officer."

One of the top requirements for any campus law enforcement program is a high caliber person who can relate to all of the members of the educational community. Leitner and Sedlacek (1976) write that the varied duties of a police officer require a myriad of abilities and skills. A campus law enforcement officer needs not only the skills of a municipal officer, but must also possess characteristics that enable him or her to perform in a young, multi-racial, intelligent, active and outspoken community.

In a survey conducted in 1968 by the International Association of College and University Security Directors forty-two percent of the institutions surveyed indicated a preference for recruits with some college education. Thirty-four percent preferred to employ high school graduates. Thirteen percent preferred college grauates (Whitehead and Van Meter 1968).

Many institutions are requiring a minimum of two years of college, and an increasing number of colleges and universities have established a bachelor degree as a qualification for employment. Wayne State University not only requires a college degree, but also that the applicant must be enrolled in the university's graduate school. Many institutions are encouraging officers to enroll in degree programs and basing their salary on the college credits they attain (U. S. News and World Report 1972).

Although women are still a distinct minority in the campus police force, more and more are being hired each year. According to a 1971 survey, women security officers numbered about 3,700, or about 1% of security officers in the country. In 1973, it was estimated that there were about 5,500 women police officers serving on college campuses (Dukiet 1973).

College campuses have diverse student populations with wide ethnic and racial diversity which calls for careful attention from those who serve the academic community. Special effort must be made to develop policy concerning the recruitment of minority candidates for campus police departments. Witt and Robinson (1976) write that in order to effect better police rapport on campus, police officers must reflect the different groups within the campus communities being served.

On all college campuses there is need for a professional, well-trained and well-disciplined law enforcement agency. Campus law enforcement departments perform all police services performed by local governments, plus those functions inherent in an academic community. Campus police officers must be trained so that they can adequately perform all police services required by the campus community. A basic police training course is essential for all officers (Nielsen 1971).

The need for police training is recognized universally. Richert and Leitner (1974) state that training should be required and employment should be conditional on the continuation of this training. The need to maintain an effective force and professional standards among campus police

can only be met with training in the basics of law enforcement procedures (Kimble 1975). Brinkley (1972) proposed professionalizing campus police departments through specialized training. In addition to basic police training the campus police officer must be trained to be sensitive to the rights and needs of the people in the academic community. The officer must be qualified to understand and respond sensitively to the problems of law enforcement on a college or university campus (Evangelides and Browner 1976). A course in human relations is essential. Campus police officers must be made aware of and more sensitive to the behavior of various cultural and socio-economic groups and to pertinent critical issues (Abramson and Nielsen 1973).

Act 149, giving police authority to campus law enforcement officers in the community, specified that campus police could only exercise their powers and perform their duties after they completed a course of training approved by the chief of police of the municipality in which the school was located. In the interest of administering uniform training, the Department of Education in 1970 established the Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Academy. The academy is the only state wide training center in the nation specifically created for the training of campus police officers.

The basic law enforcement officer course is designed to last twelve weeks and covers such topics as: Introduction to the Criminal Justice System, Law, Human Values and Problems, Patrol and Investigation Procedures, Police Proficiency and Administration (Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Academy 1976).

The Act also has implications for the training of campus police. The law specifies that the campus police shall exercise their police powers only after they have completed a course of training including crisis intervention training and riot control.

The organization and operations of campus law enforcement departments is of importance in the development of policy. Most concepts of municipal police organization apply to campus police as well. Nielson (1971) writes that by focusing on aspects unique to the campus community, traditional police management and field procedures can be applied toward the establishment of an effective and efficient law enforcement unit on college and university campuses. Community respect and cooperation can be earned by revamping campus police along traditional lines (Shanahan 1974). The size of the institution and its force will determine the internal organization. Large departments may have special operations and units including intelligence, security, tactical, community relations and other special unique functions. In small departments all the officers may be generalists.

A number of institutions have adopted the public safety department concept. They place the police, safety and fire fighting functions in one department. The public safety service concept involves the establishment of functional responses in three service areas of concern to all segments of the campus community. They are protective services, safety services, and traffic safety and control services. Kassinger (1971) writes, "The public safety role is directed at supporting, preserving, and fostering the

achievement of a community in which the students, faculty and staffs can sense a pride and determination to maintain a suitable climate for teaching, learning, research and community service."

The question of weapons being carried by campus police has been hotly debated. The events at Kent State and Jackson State have made the academic community sensitive to the use of force, especially guns, on campus. In the study, previously mentioned, of member institutes of Association of Security Directors (1968) officers carried firearms in 127 of the institutions polled, whereas 58 did not permit officers to carry weapons. Calder (1974) writes that the equipment for use in campus police activities must be similar, if not identical, to municipal police equipment.

PROCEDURES

In order to make recommendations for the formulation and implementation of policy on campus law enforcement, a survey was conducted of existing law enforcement policies and procedures within the fourteen state owned colleges and university. The investigation was conducted in order to benefit from the experience of these institutions in the area of campus security. Each of the fourteen state owned colleges and university has a very diverse student population and a particular kind of physical diversity and geographical location that dictates its law enforcement problems. In addition, opinions of individuals professionally employed in law enforcement were solicited on specific topics.

The research design selected for this study was the descriptive method. The purpose for selecting this design was to permit the collection of factual information that describes existing phenomona and to make comparisons (Isaac and Michener 1971). The knowledge of how other institutions deal with the issues of law enforcement and the opinions of experts in the field served as a basis for making policy recommendations.

The study attempted to focus on general concepts which appear to be universally applicable. Its purpose was to systematically describe the facts and characteristics of the campus police departments in the fourteen state owned institutions. Of special interest was the function or

mission of the department; the location of the campus police within the administrative structure of the college; the size and internal organization of the force; the selection and training requirements for the officers; and the various equipment needs of a campus police department. The study also examined existing policies at the various institutions on the use of firearms, the arrest of students, police involvement in the residence halls; student demonstrations and disruptions; the use of campus police for enforcing fire and safety standards; and the liaison with other public safety agencies.

A questionnaire was used to obtain the data and background information necessary to make constructive recommendations for the formulation of policy concerning campus law enforcement. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A.

Content validity for the questionnaire was determined by standard procedures (Cronbach 1960). The instrument was developed by the author based on issues and concerns raised in the review of the literature and the data requested by the Board of Presidents. It was then reviewed by faculty members of the criminal justice department and members of the campus law enforcement department at West Chester State College to determine if the instrument would obtain the data which was being sought. Based on recommendations from this counsel the original questionnaire was modified to its present form.

The reliability, or the internal consistency of the questionnaire, was more difficult to determine. The nature of the instrument did not lend itself to the usual methods (i.e. equivalent forms, split half of test-retest) of

analyzing the reliability (Tylor 1963). Most of the questions were of a factual nature. To determine the reliability of these items, the answers supplied by the vice presidents were checked with the responses provided by the chiefs or directors of campus police departments. In all instances the data provided by the vice presidents coincided with those of the law enforcement officers. The reliability of those items which required an opinion was not determined due to the nature of the items and the time frame of the study.

The questionnaire was administered to the fourteen senior administrative officers responsible for law enforcement at each institution. All fourteen vice presidents responded.

In addition to the data collected from the distribution of the questionnaire, a sample of eight chiefs or directors of campus police departments, two faculty members of the Pennsylvania Department of Education Law Enforcement Academy, and three faculty members of the criminal justice department at West Chester State College were interviewed concerning opinions on law enforcement policies and procedures. The items on the questionnaire that required an opinion or recommendation served as a standardization of the interview technique.

Results of replies to factual items on the questionnaire were tabulated on a numerical and percentage basis. Responses to open-ended items were analyzed and compared and reported in edited narrative form.

All research projects, whether statistical or descriptive, must involve a series of assumptions. For the

purpose of this study, it was assumed that the responses of the representatives of the institutions completing the survey were accurate. Another assumption made was that the issues examined are typical of issues encountered by institutions of higher education in the development of law enforcement policy. It was not assumed that a set of clear answers would result, nor was it assumed that the investigation was associated with any effort to produce uniform policies within the state system of educational institutions. The investigation was an attempt to obtain data that could be adapted to West Chester State College with its unique characteristics.

Variables that cannot be controlled are a part of any study. A number of limitations apply to the investigation. First, the sample was small and the selection of subjects to be interviewed were based on accessibility rather than on a random basis. The statistical reliability of the open-ended items on the questionnaire was not determined. Due to space limitation, it was not possible to use the statements of the respondents in their entirety. In editing them, every effort was made to report those points that were most essential and most relevant. Finally, results are unique to the state owned system of colleges and university and recommendations for policy formulation apply only to West Chester State College.

In the field of criminal justice there are philosophical as well as functional differences between the terms "security" and "police." For the purpose of this study, however, the terms "security," "police," and "law enforcement" were used interchangeably except in those areas where a

distinction was being made in terms of function or mission.

RESULTS

The official titles of the law enforcement agencies at each of the fourteen state owned colleges and university and the titles of the administrative officers to whom that department reports appears in Table 2.

In analyzing the official titles, the word "security" appeared in the title of eight departments. The word "safety" appeared in six titles. The words "law enforcement" were found in the title at five institutions. The words "police" and "service" appeared only once in official titles. The most commonly used names were the "Department of Security" or "Campus Security."

Thirteen of the administrative officers, completing the questionnaire, indicated that in their opinion the official title of the department was appropriate. Only one vice president indicated a preference for a change to "Department of Public Safety." The responses of the professional law enforcement personnel were significantly different. Five of the eight chiefs or directors interviewed indicated they were dissatisfied with the official title and preferred the title "Campus Police." The faculty of the criminal justice department was unanimous in recommending the title "Department of Law Enforcement." The two faculty members of the academy preferred the word "police" in the title.

When asked what the title for individual officers should be, six participants in the study responded with

Table 2

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL TITLES OF CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO WHOM AGENCY REPORTS

Institution	Official Title	Administrative Officer
Bloomsburg	Dept. Safety & Security	Asst. Vice President Administration
California	Campus Security	Vice President Administrative Affairs
Cheyney	Dept. Law Enforcement & Safety	Vice President Fiscal Affairs
Clarion	Dept. Law Enforcement & Safety	Director Physical Plant
E. Stroudsburg	Dept. Safety, Security & Service	Director General Services
Edinboro	Dept. of Law Enforcement	Vice President College Development
Indiana	Public Safety Division	Vice President Administration
Kutztown	Campus Security	Business Manager
Lock Haven	Dept. Law Enforcement & Safety	Vice President for Administration
Mansfield	Campus Security	Vice President Administrative Affairs
Millersville	Dept. of Security	Vice President Student Affairs
Shippensburg	Campus Security	Vice President Administration
Slippery Rock	Campus Security Police	President
West Chester	Dept. of Law Enforcement	Vice President Student Affairs

"peace officer"; four preferred "police officer"; four selected "security officer"; and three chose "law enforcement officer."

The results indicated that 71 percent, or 10 campus police agencies, reported directly to a vice president. Two departments answered to a vice president through a director or business manager. At one institution law enforcement reported directly to the president. The responses further indicated that 11, or 78 percent, of the law enforcement agencies were in the administrative and/or fiscal affairs division of the management structure of the institution. The campus police were in the student affairs division at two institutions.

The 14 administrators to whom law enforcement reported were unanimous in their support of the status quo concerning lines of reporting. No administrator recommended a change. Three of the chiefs and 2 academy faculty members recommended a direct line of reporting to the president of the institution.

All fourteen institutions in the state system reported that they operated their own police departments. All members of the department were employed under civil service classification and were listed on the institution's official complement roster. One institution, however, utilized its own officers only during the daytime. For protection at night and on weekends it entered into a service purchase contract with a commercial security organization. One other institution reported hiring outside security personnel for special events such as athletic contests and dances.

The breakdown in personnel complement of the 14 law enforcement agencies studied appears in Table 3 and Table 4. The data in Table 3 indicates that a total of 205 persons were employed as security or police officers in the 14 state colleges and university. Forty-nine, or 24 percent were employed under the Pennsylvania Civil Service classification system as security officers and 156, or 76 percent were listed as police officers. Table 3 further indicates that, of the 205 individuals employed in campus law enforcement, 166, or 81 percent, were commissioned officers and have full police authority.

The results of the survey showed that 9 women, or approximately 4 percent of the total number of officers, were employed on the 14 campuses. Men make up 96 percent of those hired for campus law enforcement work. The number of black males employed was 8, or 4 percent of the total force. Only 1 black female was employed (Table 4).

The attitude of the administrative officers toward educational requirements for campus police officers was split evenly. Six administrators recommended a high school diploma, and 6 felt the associate degree should be required. One vice president preferred the bachelor's degree and 1 suggested that the high school diploma be required for employment as a security officer and the bachelor's degree for obtaining a position as a police officer. Four of the 6 administrators willing to accept the high school diploma as minimum stated they preferred more education.

Three of the 8 chiefs interviewed stated a preference for the associate degree, and 2 for the high school diploma.

Table 3

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY COMPLEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES BROKEN DOWN BY CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION

Institution	Complement Police Officer	Security Officer	Total	No. Commissioned
Bloomsburg	15	1	16	15
California	8	7	15	8
Cheyney	13	6	19	10
Clarion	11	1	12	10
E. Stroudsburg	9	6	15	12
Edinboro	19	0	19	19
Indiana	14	1	15	15
Kutztown	6	1	7	6
Lock Haven	6	1	7	6
Mansfield	6	7	13	9
Millersville	5	9	14	5
Shippensburg	15	0	15	15
Slippery Rock	16	0	16	16
West Chester	13	9	22	20
TOTAL	156 76%	49 24%	205	166 81%

Table 4

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY COMPLEMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES BROKEN DOWN BY SEX AND RACE

Institution	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female
Bloomsburg	14	1	1	0
California	14	0	1	0
Cheyney	3	0	15	1
Clarion	11	0	1	0
E. Stroudsburg	13	2	0	0
Edinboro	17	2	0	0
Indiana	15	0	0	0
Kutztown	7	0	0	0
Lock Haven	7	0	0	0
Mansfield	13	0	0	0
Millersville	12	1	1	0
Shippensburg	14	1	0	0
Slippery Rock	15	0	1	0
West Chester	19	1	2	0
TOTAL	174 85%	8 4%	22 11%	1 -

A significant remark made by one of the chiefs was that it was hard to hold college graduates because there was not much room for advancement in a small police force. Another chief stated that we miss good prospects by ignoring high school graduates. All 5 faculty members who participated in the study recommended the bachelor's degree for employment.

Eight of the 14 state owned schools required members of the campus police to attend the Pennsylvania Department of Education Law Enforcement Academy and 6 did not. However, 4 of the institutions that did not require it, strongly recommended attendance at the academy. Eleven of the schools surveyed accepted equivalent training in lieu of attendance at the academy. Twenty-six of the 27 individuals interviewed or completing questionnaires favored the administration of a physical fitness test prior to employment. A total of 11, or approximately 40 percent also stated they would like to see some type of psychological test administered prior to hiring.

Data presented in Table 5 indicates the equipment available to campus law enforcement agencies at the 14 state owned colleges and university. Firearms were carried by law enforcement officers at 4 institutions and were available at a fifth school only for emergency situations. Nine of the institutions which responded did not permit their police departments to be armed. The use of non-lethal weapons was also limited. Security departments at 5 institutions carried mace and a sixth had it available. A baton was carried at only 4 institutions and was available at 1 other college. All of the schools surveyed, except one, provided marked police vehicles for the department of law enforcement. All

Table 5

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITY
LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES'
AVAILABILITY OF EQUIPMENT

Institution	Carry Firearms	Conditions Under Which Carried	Mace	Baton	Marked Cars
Bloomsburg	No		No	No	1
California	No		No	No	0
Cheyney	Yes	24 hrs.	Yes	Yes	1
Clarion	No		No	No	2
E. Stroudsburg	No		No	No	1
Edinboro	Yes	24 hrs.	No	Yes	1
Indiana	No		Yes	Yes	1
Kutztown	No		No	No	1
Lock Haven	No		No*	No*	1
Mansfield	No*		Yes	No	1
Millersville	No		Yes	No	2
Shippensburg	No		No	No	2
Slippery Rock	Yes	24 hrs.	No	No	2
West Chester	Yes	night shifts bank runs	Yes	Yes	2

*available

14 colleges and university provided uniforms for the officers. This was required under a collective bargaining agreement. Finally, all 14 institutions equipped their campus police departments with electronic communication systems.

In terms of organizational structure, 6 institutions reported having a member of the department designated as an investigator or detective. The term criminal investigator was used in all cases to identify the individual. Eight institutions indicated that no individual was specifically assigned that function or so titled.

On 6 campuses the department was charged with insuring compliance with applicable provisions of the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Act. Eight departments did not have that duty. The responsibility of fire prevention and safety was assigned to campus security on 11 of the 14 campuses.

Eleven institutions in the survey utilized students in their law enforcement programs and 3 did not. The functions assigned to student security included building security involving door and light checks; parking and traffic control; radio dispatching; ground control at dances and athletic events; ambulance service; residence hall security; and patrol and observe.

Three schools responded that a formalized mutual aid agreement with surrounding municipal police agencies was in force. Eleven institutions had no such written policy. However, 5 stated that an informal written agreement existed, and 2 schools stated that they were in the process of signing such an agreement.

The question concerning the existence of a formal set of written law enforcement policies and procedures was answered affirmatively by only 2 schools. The remaining 12 institutions stated that a number of policies existed but they were not a part of any formalized document. A few policies were in written form, but most were of a verbal or in an "agreement of understanding" form. The areas and the number of institutions in which some form of policy existed were: the use of firearms (3); the arrest of students (7); student demonstrations and disruptions (6); the use of outside police (2); police in the residence halls (2); and bomb threats (1).

Thirteen of the institutions responding have no standing advisory committee on law enforcement. At 1 college, where law enforcement was under the Vice President for Student Affairs, the student affairs committee composed of 3 faculty, 3 administrators, and 6 students developed regulations and reviewed policy. Another institution indicated that an ad-hoc committee composed of faculty, students, and administrators had been established to review law enforcement procedures on the campus. Six institutions reported having formalized committees on parking.

Listed below is a sampling of opinions from administrators concerning the primary function of campus police:

Safety and Security
Protection of Persons and Property
Safety, Security, and Service
Protective and Safety Services
Maintain a Safe Environment
Insure Overall Safety of People and Facilities

A sampling of opinions, from professionals in the field of law enforcement, concerning the primary mission is

stated below:

Keep Peace
Keep Peace and Tranquility
Protection of Individuals' Rights, Life, and Property
Safety of People and the Care and Protection of State Property
Safety of Persons and Property

Finally, in reviewing the responses, "for any additional suggestions for improving campus law enforcement," three basic areas predominated. First, that each institution should maintain local autonomy for directing and implementing a program of campus security. Secondly, that there was a need to change the regulations concerning hiring. A number of respondents felt that civil service classifications were a limiting factor. A general feeling was that no civil service classification accurately reflected the job required for campus law enforcement. Finally, there was a universal need for additional complement.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings suggest a number of factors that should be taken into consideration in the development and implementation of policy and procedures for campus law enforcement at West Chester State College. The results of the study showed that all fourteen of the state owned colleges and university had exercised the options provided by legislation and had created campus police departments. The mission of these agencies, however, varied from campus to campus.

If an assumption can be made that the title of an organization reflects its function, then the analysis of the official titles should indicate the assigned role campus police are expected to perform. The results clearly demonstrated a preference for the "security-safety" function rather than the "police" function. This probably reflects a negative connotation that many members of the academic community place on the word "police." Such an aversion to the police concept is probably a carry over from the 1960s.

Information gained from the study points out the differences in opinion held by the professionals in the field of law enforcement and "civilians." While almost 100 percent of the administrators were satisfied, the law enforcement people preferred a change in title which would reflect the "police" and "law enforcement" function.

The anti-police attitude that existed can also be substantiated by the positions taken by the institutions

concerning firearms on campus. Seventy percent of the schools did not permit their officers to carry firearms, even though 81 percent of the men working were commissioned police officers.

There are several important distinctions between campus policing and campus security. By recognizing the differences between the two functions, a more objective basis would exist for making concrete policy recommendations concerning law enforcement. West Chester State College will have to resolve those differences. The academic community will have to review its attitude toward campus police, especially in light of increased crime on campus.

Whether the function is of a "security" or a "police" nature there is a necessity for the upgrading of campus law enforcement to a professional status. The campus police department must be completely professionalized if the services offered to the academic community are to gain complete acceptance--not just tolerance. Policies must be developed that deal with the staffing, training, equipping and organization of a professional law enforcement department.

The fourteen state owned colleges and university vary greatly in student enrollment and geographical location, yet the results of the study indicated that the size of the security complement was about the same at each school. The average size of the police force on each campus was a little over fifteen.

It seems obvious that those schools near urban areas, where crime is higher, and with larger enrollments need more police support than small rural campuses. If one considers

that the law enforcement department operates twenty-four hours a day seven days a week throughout the year, and that personnel get sick, have days off, and take vacations, an average force of fifteen is spread quite thinly. West Chester must evaluate its employment and staffing policies to see that sufficient manpower is available for campus security.

Another concern raised by the study was the use of "rent-a-cops." Two institutions indicated the employment of commercial security agencies. Contract guards cannot provide the progressive, responsive, intelligent service needed to serve college campuses.

A further concern was raised in reviewing the complement of campus security departments throughout the commonwealth. A factor that must be considered in policy formulation is the race and sex make up of those employed in police work. Women made up only 4 percent of the work force and blacks 11 percent. There is no justification for the small number of women employed when one considers that women students outnumber men by 60 to 40 percent on the campuses of the state colleges. While 11 percent looks positive with regard to minority recruitment, it should be noted that one college employed over 70 percent of the blacks. Recruitment and selection policy for campus law enforcement personnel must take into account affirmative action guidelines. In the development of policy it is necessary to clearly enunciate the qualifications for employment.

Police work requires a great degree of expertise and specialization. The study indicated only a little more than half of the schools required attendance at the state directed

law enforcement academy. The reason for this lack of participation should be investigated.

In developing policy for the selection of campus police officers the educational level of the recruits should be considered. The study indicated that policy varies from institution to institution, but the consensus appeared to be a trend toward more education with the associate degree as the norm.

Finally, the findings suggest that there is a need for a statement of working policy with regards to the appropriate responsibilities to be exercised by campus police on most campuses. The question that must be answered is whether this should be a uniform policy adopted for state wide implementation, or should each institution have the opportunity to develop and implement its own? Eighty-five percent of the schools surveyed indicated a lack of formalized policy. A fear was voiced throughout the interviews over the possibility of the state establishing uniform policy and procedures for the colleges. Everyone concerned with the study desired the autonomy to direct their own law enforcement operations. Unless the separate institutions develop and adopt formal policy, their fears may come true.

There are a number of recommendations that can be made as a result of this study that should be considered in the development of policy. First there needs to be a formulization of the mission West Chester State College wishes to assign to its law enforcement department. Police authority today is an absolute must if a campus department is to effectively cope with crime. However, it should only be given to

qualified trained officers who know what the law provides and are concerned with protecting the rights of the individual. It is recommended that the title be changed to Department of Law Enforcement and Safety and that the individual officers be called Peace Officer. It is hoped that the selection of these titles will convey the role of a modern professional law enforcement department operating on a college campus and that it will help to ameliorate the difference in opinions that exist in the academic community concerning law enforcement.

Since the campus community will need to be educated to the new mission of the department, it is recommended that an all college committee be created, consisting of representatives from all constituencies on the campus to articulate the new mission. Such a group would also provide a power base to influence the campus governance system in adopting such a philosophy on law enforcement. Such a committee would also serve to formulate operating policy and serve as a "civilian" review board.

It is further recommended that this committee develop operational policies and that the college governance system adopt such policies. Operating policy should initially be developed in the areas of employment, training, use of firearms, arrest of students, use of police in the residence halls, and mutual aid with neighboring municipal police.

It is inconceivable to ask any police officer to apprehend violators of the law without being armed. It is recommended that a policy be developed to permit campus police officers to carry weapons whenever on duty. At the same time

it is recommended that such a policy include the limitations on the use of force by security officers. Force should only be used when officers are likely to be exposed to attack or threat of great bodily harm, or are protecting other persons against whom deadly force is imminent. The policy should also include provisions for regularly qualifying in the use of firearms.

It is recommended that in any policy developed in regards to hiring, consideration be given to requiring the associate degree for employment. Since West Chester offers a degree in criminal justice, it is suggested that salary and promotion be contingent on pursuing a bachelor's degree. The college should waiver tuition, and the officers' work hours should be adjusted to allow the officer to attend classes. Affirmative action guidelines should be established to increase the department's complement of women and blacks.

Policy in the area of training should require all new officers to attend the Department of Education Law Enforcement Academy. In addition, the director of the department should be charged with developing and implementing an ongoing in-service training program.

It is recommended that the campus police's presence in the residence halls be limited to public, non-residential areas and to checking the security of outside exits. Such a policy provides protection but maintains the right to privacy of the students.

Any policy developed should not be in violation of state law. It is recommended that all policy formulation should be submitted to legal counsel for review and to see if

it is in conformity with administrative and criminal codes.

In conclusion, campus police should be given broad responsibility for enforcing the law. Their authority should be commensurate with that responsibility. The campus law enforcement department must be staffed, equipped, organized, and trained so that it can adequately perform all police services required by the campus community.

REFERENCES

Abell, Richard B., Police Legal Coordinator, District Attorney's Police Education Council. Letter to Police Chief, West Chester State College, February 10, 1976.

Abramson, Stephen A. and Robert C. Nielsen. Human relations training for campus police. College Management, Vol. 8 No. 9, November/December, 1973.

Act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, PL 75, July 30, 1975.

Act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, PL 149, July 7, 1968.

"A Plea for Action," Editorial, The Quad, Vol. 45, No. 6, October 20, 1976, 4.

Basic Law Enforcement Officers Course Syllabus. Law Enforcement Academy, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Education, Law Enforcement Division, Chambersburg, Pa., 1976.

Bernitt, Richard O. Campus law enforcement: town-gown relations. New Directions in Campus Law Enforcement: A Handbook for Administrators. Athens: University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, 1971.

Blocker, Clyde E., Louis W. Bender and S. V. Martorana. The Political Terrain of American Post Secondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1975.

Board of Presidents. Minutes of Meeting, April 1-2, 1976.

Board of State College and University Directors. Minutes of Meeting, July 15, 1976.

Brinkley, G. N. University police-changes which must be made. Police, Vol. 16, No. 12, August, 1972, 40-49.

Calder, James D. Policing and securing the campus. Police Chief, Vol. 41, No. 11, November, 1974, 60-64.

"Campus Crimes and Security," Report of Panel Discussion, New York: Burns Security Institute, Briarcliff Manor, 1973.

Carnegie Commission. "Dissent and Disruption," Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1971.

"Co-ed Attacked," The Quad, Vol. 45, No. 5., October 19, 1976.

"Crime Wave Hits Colleges," U. S. News & World Report, Vol. 61, No. 21, November 22, 1971, 24-26.

"Crime Wave on Campus," Time, Vol. 101, No. 14, April 2, 1973, 77.

Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing, 2d ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1960.

Dukiet, Kenneth H. Awareness is key to revention of campus crime. College Management, Vol. 8, No. 9, November/December, 1973, 16-17.

Evangelides, Alice Sofis and Kathleen Browner. Bringing university police into the academic community. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association. April-May, 1976, Vol. 27, No. 2, 40-45.

Hood, Albert B. and Richard T. Hodges. The effect of a serious crime upon attitudes toward residence hall security. Journal of College Student Personnel, September, 1974, Vol. 15, No. 5, 352-356.

Isaac, Stephen and William B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Edits Publishers, 1971.

Kassinger, Edward T. The need for professionalization of campus law enforcement. New Directions on Campus Law Enforcement: A Handbook for Administrators. Athens: University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, 1971.

Kauffman, William R., Deputy Attorney General. Letter to Dr. Charles G. Mayo, President, West Chester State College, July 15, 1976.

Kimble, A. University of Houston police outline of standards and goals. Campus Law Enforcement Journal, Vol. 5, No. 6, November/December, 1975, 25-29.

Leitner, Dennis W. and William E. Sedlacek. Characteristics of successful campus police officers. Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 17, No. 4, July, 1976, 304-308.

LeMay, Morris. College disciplinary problems: a review. The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 7, No. 3, May, 1968, 180-189.

Levi, Albert W. Violence and the universities. The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10, No. 2, March, 1969, 87-95.

Linowitz, Sol M. "Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations," Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, American Council on Education, 1970.

McCabe, Robert H. The Education Policy Systems. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973.

Magarell, Jack. Universities may fact greater responsibility for security. Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 13. No. 5, October 4, 1976, 5.

Nielsen, Swen C. General Organizational and Administrative Concepts for University Police. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1971.

Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Research and Development. Uniform Crime Report Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Annual Report, 1975.

Powell, J. W. Campus security needs professionals. College and University Business Magazine, April, 1970, 94-95.

_____. Campus security today: progressive but sensitive. American School and University, Vol. 45, No. 2, 1972, 17-20.

_____. Why you should not 'rent a cop'. College Management, Vol. 9, No. 9, November/December, 1974, 33-35.

Richert, J. P. and L. Leitner. Model for recruiting and training campus security. Police Chief, Vol. 41, No. 7, 1974, 3.

"Security Police Maintain Good Will, Great Record," American School and University, Vol. 46, No. 12, August, 1974, 20-24.

Shanahan, M. G. Criminal justice venture-the University of Washington police department. Police Chief, Vol. 41, No. 7, July, 1974, 72-75.

Sims, O. Suthern, Jr. Campus law enforcement and student affairs: a definition of roles. New Directions in Campus Law Enforcement: A Handbook for Administrators. Athens: University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, 1971.

"Student Shot Near Hollinger," The Quad, Vol. 45, No. 6, October 26, 1976, 1.

"Students Policing Students," U. S. News & World Report, Vol. LXXII, No. 4, January 24, 1972, 6[illegible].

Tyler, Leona E. Tests and Measurements. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Watkins, Beverly T. Growing crime rate worries campus police. Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 10, No. 20, August 18, 1975, 8.

West Chester State College Board of Trustees. Minutes of Meeting, March 19, 1975.

West Chester State College Faculty Senate. Minutes of Meeting, July 24, 1976.

Whitehead, A. T. and C. VanMeter. Security services analysis. Athens: International Association of College and University Security Directors, 1962.

Witt, James W. and Eugene M. Robinson. Minority recruitment and retention. The Police Chief, Vol. XLIII, No. 9, September, 1976.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY ON CAMPUS POLICE

1. Name of Institution _____

2. Name of Person Completing this Survey _____

   Title _____

3. Does your institution employ its own police department? Yes_____ No_____

   If no, does your institution have police or security personnel retained under a service purchase contract basis? Yes_____ No_____

4. What is the official title of your campus police department? _____

   In your opinion is this title appropriate for campus police? Yes_____ No_____

   If no, what would you recommend? _____

5. What is the title of the administrative officer to whom the campus police report? _____

   In your opinion is this the appropriate officer? Yes_____ No_____

   If no, what administrative office should they report to? _____

6. What is the total complement in the campus police department?

Police Officer III	_____	Security Officer III	_____
Police Officer II	_____	Security Officer II	_____
Police Officer I	_____	Security Officer I	_____

   Please break down the department in the following categories:

White male	_____	Black male	_____
White female	_____	Black female	_____
Hispanic male	_____	Hispanic female	_____

   How many officers are commissioned? _____

7. What educational qualifications would you recommend as a minimum requirement for a campus police officer?

High school graduate _____ Bachelor's degree _____
Associate degree _____ Master's degree _____

Do you require all members of the campus police department to attend the Commonwealth Department of Education Law Enforcement Academy? Yes _____ No_____

Do you accept equivalent training; i.e. State Police Academy, county police school, Philadelphia or Pittsburgh police academy? Yes_____ No_____

Do you feel that a physical fitness test should be administered to prospective officers before employment? Yes_____ No_____

Do you feel that a physical fitness test should be administered periodically following employment? Yes_____ No_____

8. Does your institution have an advisory committee on law enforcement? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what is the constituency?

_____ Faculty
_____ Students
_____ Administrators
_____ Non-Instructional
_____ Board of Trustees
_____ Community

9. Do you utilize student security? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, under what conditions? _____

_____

10. Does your institution have a formalized mutual aid agreement with surrounding municipal police agencies? Yes_____ No_____

11. Is the campus police department charged with insuring compliance with applicable provisions of the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSHA)? Yes_____ No_____

12. Is the campus police department charged with fire prevention and safety? Yes_____ No_____

13. In the organizational structure of your campus police department is there a special division or person designated as investigator or detective? Yes_____ No_____

14. Does your campus police department carry firearms? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, please describe the conditions _____

_____

_____

Training Requirements: _____

_____

15. Do your officers carry mace? Yes_____ No_____

Do your officers carry a baton? Yes_____ No_____

Does your institution maintain marked police vehicles? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, number _____

Is your campus police department equipped with a radio communication system? Yes_____ No_____

Do you provide uniforms for the campus police? Yes_____ No_____

16. Does your institution have a formal set of written law enforcement policies and procedures? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, in which of the following areas?

_____ Firearms

_____ Arrest of students

_____ Student demonstrations and disruptions

_____ Use of outside police assistance

_____ Police in residence halls

_____ Relationship between police and firemen

_____ Surveillance of members of college community

_____ Other_____

17. In your opinion, what is the primary role of a campus police department?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Writer's Name Louis F. Weislogel

Cluster Eastern Pennsylvania

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

11/19/76 (date) Lawrence Abrams (signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

11/21/76 (date) Robert L. Kanzinsky (signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

11/29/76 (date) Diane Piwowarski (signature of peer reader)

.....

I certify that I have read this practicum report and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for practicums in the Doctor of Education Program.

(date) (signature of Practicum Director)